

EPA Air Toxics Pilot Working Group
Meeting Summary
December 11, 2001

Members and Others Attending: Bill Skowronski, Hollie Dellisanti, Rev. Marvin Smith, Tim Nieberding, Bob Leidich, Adam Zeller, Kevin Snape, Dennis Finn, Mary Smith, Emily Lee, Stuart Greenberg, Mike Suver, Bill Davis, Eleanor Bycoski, Victoria Peterlin, Lori Kondas, Jacquie Gillon, Herb Mausser, Joe Calabrese, Kathleen Gaiser.

Members Absent: Anjali Mathur, Glenn Landers, Amy Ryder, Virginia Aveni, Michael Krzywicki, Rev. Maurice Hocket, Laura Hobson, Jerome Walcott, Mandie Domanovic, Tom McCleary, Kyle Dreyfuss-Wells, Paige Akins, Jacquie Gillon, Amy Simpson, Ron Kunkle, Elizabeth Shaw, Richard King.

Facilitators: Patrick Field, Sanda Kaufman, and Allison Berland

Decisions Made

Number	Decision	Cost
#6	Education to limit vehicle idling	No Cost
#7	Car pooling and public transportation campaign	No Cost
#8	Low sulfur diesel fuel replacement for RTA circulator buses	\$25,000
#9	Portable Gas Can trade-in	\$25,000
#10	Train four schools in a Tools for Schools Pilot	\$23,000
#11	Hire a CSU intern for data inventory analysis and other work.	\$9,000

The Ohio Air Toxics Working Group convened for the sixth time at the Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University. The facilitators began by reviewing the agenda and noted that they would be preparing this meeting summary.

Review October Meeting Summary and Outstanding Action Items

The facilitators reviewed the status of the October meeting summary. The Working Group had no questions or concerns, and the summary was approved. There were no questions regarding outstanding action items. The facilitators asked for each subcommittee to take up to 15 minutes to report back on their work.

Report from Transportation Subcommittee

Kathleen Gaiser, coordinator, reported on the work of the transportation subcommittee.

Kathleen gave a description of a number of project recommendations the transportation subcommittee has been researching. The following is a list projects the subcommittee put forward to the Working Group:

- The Non-Road Engine Highway Diesel Fueling project would provide non-road engine operators access to highway diesel.
- The Diesel Retrofit Program would choose a fleet to install PM filters to make them cleaner.
- The Education Program to limit idling would provide information to vehicle and equipment operators about the benefits of limiting idling. Working Group members suggested targeting school buses.
- The Circulator Bus Replacement and Ultra Low Sulfur fueling project would pay for refueling ten new RTA buses with ultra low sulfur fuel.
- The Car-pool matching and Pass Validation project would promote employee pass subsidies and a car-pool matching service.
- The Portable Gas Can Trade-In Program would fund the trade-in of older gas cans for improved low evaporation models.

Working Group members discussed the project costs for each of these recommendations. One member asked the EPA to clarify the amount of money the Working Group has to implement projects. The EPA responded that the Working Group has about \$600,000. One member stressed the need to make sure the Working Group gets the most “bang for its buck” when it chooses projects.

Report from Schools Subcommittee

Emily Lee, coordinator, reported on the status of the work in the Schools Subcommittee. Emily presented a project proposal to train four public schools in a Tools for Schools Pilot including two public and two parochial schools. The pilot would bring in professional contractors to conduct walk-throughs of the schools and take note of improvements. After the completion of the pilot, other schools would be trained in Tools for Schools using the four pilot schools as resources and mentors.

One Working Group member asked what would happen if a serious problem was discovered in the walk-through. Mary Smith from the EPA commented that there are problems in the best of schools and that if a problem is found, there are other sources of money to fix the problem. The member noted that difficult fiscal situation of Cleveland schools and noted they may not be able to implement all of the good recommendations.

Emily noted that the School Subcommittee hopes to start training by the end of January.

Report from Business Subcommittee

Bill Skowronski provided a summary of projects the Business Subcommittee has been researching. He first noted that the subcommittee would like to put a placeholder of \$10,000 for a project that would offer audits to neighborhood businesses but not request the money at this time. The audits would identify best business practices and in turn get that information out to local businesses.

The Business subcommittee proposed a project to hire an intern to carry out a data analysis inventory to assist the subcommittee. The initial proposal is to hire a graduate student by the end of January to work 20 hours a week for 26 weeks. The objective of hiring an intern is to make sure that all air toxics sources are accurately represented and to assist with future pollution prevention workshops. Working Group members discussed the budget for this project, questioning whether the \$8000 project budget covered copying fees. One Working Group member suggested increasing the budget to \$9000 to account for copying fees.

Report from Home Subcommittee

Coordinator Emily Lee reported on the status of the Home Subcommittee. Emily noted that the Smoke-Free Home Pledge Campaign was a success. Ninety people pledged to keep their homes smoke-free. The Plain Dealer ran an article on the Great American Smokeout and included information about the Smoke-Free Home Pledge Campaign.

The Home Subcommittee is researching plans for its Household Toxics Collection Campaign and would like to piggy back its efforts with the County Household Hazardous Waste Campaign this spring. Emily notes that the subcommittee should be ready to propose something by February.

Questions and Comments about Proposed Projects

Working Group members spent the following hour discussing the projects presented by the four subcommittees.

One member asked how will the Working Group know that people will use the new gas cans. One member said that the number of gas cans needs to be refined. In response, a member suggested that the Working Group can purchase gas cans a little bit at a time. EPA noted that the Working Group might be able to save money if the gas cans were bought in bulk. The EPA member suggested that until we get the financial entity in place that they limit projects to \$25,000 and under. An EPA person noted that she thinks there are only three vendors that offer these types of gas cans. To promote and monitor participation, some members suggested distributing gas cans on the condition that people turn in their old gas cans.

The EPA member also suggested that money be spent on public outreach for this project. Some members suggested that the Working Group disseminate information out through neighborhood newspapers.

The facilitator laid out three options for the Working Group to consider: 1) choose projects totaling up to \$10,000; 2) choose projects totaling up to \$25,000; or 3) Wait to choose projects at this point in order to gather more information.

One member asked if the breakdown of money has to be \$150,000 per subcommittee. A member noted that this would be overly restrictive and it would be better to see where the biggest bangs for the buck are and what various subcommittees propose. Another member responded saying that the group needs to have a plan and think about how the Working Group makes decisions – Does the Working Group want to get all off the information organized and prepare and then make a decision, or make a decision and then work out the details.

The facilitator reviewed the proposed projects discussed and the package that had been created over the meeting, which includes the following six projects: 1) Education to limit vehicle idling, 2) Car pooling and public transportation campaign, 3) Low sulfur diesel fuel replacement for RTA circulator buses, 4) Portable Gas Can trade-in, 5) Hire a Cleveland State University intern for data inventory analysis and other work; 6) Conduct Tools for Schools audits in four schools.

The facilitator went through each project and asked if anyone could not live with the project. After some discussion about funding for each project, consensus was reached on this package. The facilitator stated that subcommittees should possibly look to Tools for Schools implementation plan write up as a model for fleshing out each selected project.

Update on Long-Term Funding Mechanism for Projects

EPA's member Mary Smith reviewed some things to consider with regard to what kind of funding mechanism would be most suitable for the Working Group. After speaking with many people at the EPA, she provided a list of criteria to consider in determining a suitable funding recipient organization:

1. Appropriate mission
2. Organization that operates citywide
3. Past experience with federal money
4. Low overhead costs
5. Single entity
6. No real or perceived conflict of interest, thus not asking any Working Group member to administer the funds

She has identified six organizations that the EPA is looking into. She noted that for legal and fiduciary reasons, the EPA will need to make the decision about an appropriate recipient organization. By the next meeting, EPA will have a couple of organizations to suggest to the

Working Group. The EPA member stated that by March she expects that the Working Group will have someone on board.

Check-In on the Process and Progress to Date

The facilitator provided a handout that listed what Working Group members identified (from the Convening Report) were measures of success and reviewed the status of these measures.

Evaluator Juliana Burkoff reviewed the progress of the Pilot's Evaluation. She has been monitoring what members have said from interviews and is focusing her evaluation on, 1) Collecting information to determine whether or not a project should be done again, and 2) Improving how the Working Group works together. Juliana asked the Working Group if there were things that the process needed to be doing differently, such as including field trips, changing the process or other problems that need to be addressed.

One member asked if the EPA is planning to stay or leave come January. The evaluator noted that the EPA would stay involved, but its level of involvement might change. One member complimented the EPA on bringing in the resources for this project. Another member commented that success is not just about getting people together but in making things happen.

Scheduling Next Meeting

The facilitators polled the Working Group on possible dates for the January meeting. Several possible meeting dates were put forward, including January 23, 29 and 30. The group did not reach a consensus on a meeting date. The facilitators said that they would talk with members over the upcoming week and try to find a day that is suitable to the most people.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. Please note that EPA's website for this pilot is at <http://www.epa.gov/cleveland/>